

REMARKS

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claim 15 is cancelled herein without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter set forth therein. Claims 1-14 and 16-21 are pending. Claims 1, 11-12 and 17 are amended, and claims 18-21 are added. Claims 1 and 17 are independent. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein.

Drawings

It is gratefully appreciated that the Examiner has accepted the drawings.

Claim for Priority

It is gratefully appreciated that the Examiner has acknowledged the Applicant's claim for foreign priority based on Japanese Patent Application No. 2003-037353.

Information Disclosure Citation

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for considering the reference supplied with the Information Disclosure Statements filed on September 30, 2005 and June 5, 2006, and for providing the Applicant with initialed copies of the PTO forms filed therewith.

Claim Objection

The Examiner has objected to claim 15. In order to overcome this objection, the Applicant has cancelled claim 15 in order to correct the deficiency pointed out by the Examiner. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

Claim Objection

The Examiner has objected to claim 15. In order to overcome this objection, the Applicant has cancelled claim 15 in order to correct the deficiency pointed out by the Examiner. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 9, 10, 12, 13, and 15-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Caprai (U.S. 6,251,015) in view of Ritchie (U.S. 4,637,605); and

claims 2, 5, 7, 8, 11, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Caprai and Ritchie, and further in view of Pittarelli (U.S. 3,964,564).

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Amendments to Independent Claims 1 and 17

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, independent claim 1 is amended herein to recite a combination of elements directed to a riding simulation system, including *inter alia*

a body comprising a pair of left and right main frames and a centrally located main frame for rotatably securing said steering handle mechanism; and

a control unit for said system being mounted between said pair of left and right main frames and under the centrally located main frame.

In addition, independent claim 17 is amended herein to recite a combination of elements directed to a riding simulation system, including *inter alia*

a body comprising a pair of left and right main frames and a centrally located main frame for rotatably securing said steering handle mechanism ...

said riding simulation apparatus is adapted to be mounted on an elevated mounting surface, and

wherein said pair of left and right main frames is adapted to be secured to one side of the elevated mounting surface, and said centrally located main frame is adapted to be secured to an opposite side of the elevated mounting surface.

By contrast, as can be seen in Caprai FIG. 2, this document merely discloses a controller with a flat bottom surface 18 resting on a table, and a clamp 26 below the table.

The Examiner relies on Ritchie to teach a control unit between a pair of frames.

However, neither the Caprai document nor the Ritchie document can teach or suggest “a body comprising a pair of left and right main frames and a centrally located main frame for rotatably securing said steering handle mechanism”, as required by each of claims 1 and 17 of the present invention.

At least for the reasons explained above, the Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of elements as set forth in each of independent claims 1 and 17 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Caprai and Ritchie.

Therefore, independent claims 1 and 17 are in condition for allowance.

Dependent Claims

The Examiner will note that dependent claims 10-12 have been amended, dependent claim 15 has been cancelled, and dependent claim 18-21 have been added.

All dependent claims are in condition for allowance due to their dependency from allowable independent claims, or due to the additional novel features set forth therein.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and that the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, he is invited to telephone Carl T. Thomsen (Reg. No. 50,786) at (703) 208-4030 (direct line).

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17, particularly extension of time fees.

Dated: September 19, 2007

Respectfully submitted,
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 
James M. Slattery

Reg. No. 28,380

P. O. Box 747

Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

JMS/CTT/srm 